

ARI Contractor Report 2007-10

The Leadership Formula: P*M*D

**Micha Popper, Karin Amit, Reuven Gal,
Moran Mishkal-Sinai and Alon Lisak**

The Center for Outstanding Leadership, Zichron-Yaakov
University of Haifa

This report is published to meet legal and contractual requirements and may not meet ARI's scientific and/or professional standards for publication.

August 2007

**United States Army Research Institute
for the Behavioral and Social Sciences**

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| 1. REPORT DATE (dd-mm-yy) August 2007 | 2. REPORT TYPE Final | 3. DATES COVERED (from. . . to) September 2001 to March 2004 | | | | | |
| 4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE The Leadership Formula: P*M*D | | 5a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER DASW01-01-K-0004 | | | | | |
| | | 5b. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER 611102A | | | | | |
| 6. AUTHOR(S) Micha Popper, Karin Amit, Reuvan Gal, Moran Mishkal-Sinai, & Alon Lisak (The Center for Outstanding Leadership, Zichron-Yaakov, University of Haifa) | | 5c. PROJECT NUMBER B74F | | | | | |
| | | 5d. TASK NUMBER | | | | | |
| | | 5e. WORK UNIT NUMBER 1903 | | | | | |
| 7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) The Center for Outstanding Leadership University of Haifa 5 Kadesh St. P. O. Box 97 30900 Zichron Yaakov, Israel | | 8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER | | | | | |
| 9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral & Social Sciences 2511 Jefferson Davis Highway Arlington, VA 22202-3926 | | 10. MONITOR ACRONYM ARI | | | | | |
| | | 11. MONITOR REPORT NUMBER Contractor Report 2007-10 | | | | | |
| 12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited. | | | | | | | |
| 13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Contractor Officer's Representative and Subject Matter POC: Dr. Paul A. Gade This report is published to meet legal and contractual requirements and may not meet ARI's scientific and/or professional standards for publication. | | | | | | | |
| 14. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words): Three factors, potential (P), motivation (M), and development (D) constitute the frame of reference proposed in this research for leadership development: $P \times M \times D$. The three factors are presented here in an interactive (multiplicative), rather than an additive relationship because of our prior assumption that if one of the factors is absent (or has zero value), the product of the multiplication will be zero, namely no leadership. This assumption has yet to be examined empirically, although it has been raised in the past on the basis of common sense. On the other hand, it may be argued that while one or two of the components (almost certainly potential and motivation) are essential for leadership, the third (development) is possible and additive, but not essential. This, then, is the aim of the present research: to examine the nature of the relationship between the three components. At the same time, the research assumption is that all three components are required in the leadership process and that the absence of one of them will invalidate the equation, in other words, will not produce effective leadership. | | | | | | | |
| 15. SUBJECT TERMS Leadership, potential to lead, motivation to lead, leadership development, self-efficacy, locus of control, anxiety, attachment, optimism, personality | | | | | | | |
| 16. REPORT Unclassified | | 17. ABSTRACT Unclassified | | 18. THIS PAGE Unclassified | 19. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT | 20. NUMBER OF PAGES | 21. RESPONSIBLE PERSON |
| | | | | Unlimited | 40 | Ellen Kinzer Technical Publication Specialist 703-602-8047 | |

Contractor Report 2007-10

The Leadership Formula: P*M*D

Micha Popper

The Center for Outstanding Leadership, Zichron-Yaacov
University of Haifa

Karin Amit, Reuven Gal

The Center for Outstanding Leadership, Zichron-Yaacov

Moran Mishkal-Sinai, Alon Lisak

The Center for Outstanding Leadership, Zichron-Yaacov
University of Haifa

Research and Advanced Concepts Office

Paul A. Gade, Chief

U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences
2511 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Virginia 22202-3926

August 2007

Army Project Number
611102B74F

**Personnel, Performance
and Training**

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

THE LEADERSHIP FORMULA: P*M*D

CONTENTS

| | |
|----------------------------------|----|
| THEORETICAL BACKGROUND..... | 1 |
| I. POTENTIAL TO LEAD | 4 |
| II. MOTIVATION TO LEAD | 13 |
| III. LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT..... | 21 |
| IV. MILITARY LEADERSHIP | 27 |
| NOTES..... | 30 |
| REFERENCES | 31 |

Theoretical background

Most of the psychological research conducted on leadership has focused on its measurement and/or effects (e.g., Bycioi, Hackett & Allen, 1995). We know a great deal today about the actions, behavior and influence of leaders, but very little about how they developed to become leaders. The literature addressing this issue includes mostly biographies written by historians (e.g., Bullock, 1991) some well known psycho-biographies (e.g., Erikson on Gandhi, 1969), a few historiometric studies (e.g., Mumford et al., 1993) and some psychological studies, mostly based on retrospective recollections of leaders (Klonski, 1983; Gibbons, 1986; Avolio & Gibbons, 1988; Karnes & Dillio, 1989). The lack of studies on leadership development in psychology is not fortuitous, it stems from the absence of models and empirically testable conceptualizations (see Avolio & Gibbons, 1988; Judge & Bono, 2000; Popper, 2000; Zacharatos, Barling & Kelloway, 2000).

The purpose of this research is to present a conceptual framework for understanding how leaders develop. Specifically, we intend to describe major developmental precursors of leadership and to demonstrate how the concepts presented may be translated into empirical research. Before presenting the conceptual framework it is important to emphasize the distinction between negative leaders (termed in the literature "personalized leaders," such as Hitler) and positive leaders (termed "socialized," e.g., Gandhi. See discussion of this in Howell, 1988; Howell & Avolio, 1993; House & Howell, 1992; Popper, 2002). While personalized leaders are characterized by a high level of narcissism (Popper, 2002) and exploit others for their own self aggrandizement (House & Howell, 1992), socialized leaders are characterized by respect for the followers and motivation to contribute to social and moral causes (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985; Avolio & Howell, 1992; House & Howell, 1992; Popper, Mayseless & Castelnovo, 2000; Popper, 2002). This effort relates to the type known as socialized leaders.

The internal world of leaders is thus the focus of this effort. The argument presented here is that leadership (like many other human phenomena) is a function of a given potential, relevant motivation, and an ongoing developmental process (Popper, 1994; Popper, Mayseless & Castelnovo, 2000; Popper & Mayseless, 2002). To become a musician, a person must have an ear for music (potential) and the motivation to be a musician. A person without musical talent will not become a gifted musician even if s/he has the strongest motivation, and vice versa, someone who has musical ability but lacks interest (motivation) will almost certainly not make use of that talent. Furthermore, individuals who have both musical ability and powerful motivation to become musicians will develop differently if they are taught by the best teachers in the field and are exposed to excellent musicians, in other words, if they grow in an environment that provides them with the optimal resources and atmosphere for their development as musicians. Similarly, to become an outstanding leader, an individual needs the potential to become a leader, expressed in certain ego strengths, strong motivation to lead, and finally a personal and psychological process of development, sometimes referred to as "personal growth," which shapes the individual's attitudes and enhances his/her leadership potential to its optimal level.

These three factors, potential (P), motivation (M), and development (D) constitute the frame of reference proposed in this research for leadership development: **P x M x D**. The three factors are presented here in an interactive (multiplicative), rather than an additive relationship because of our prior assumption that if one of the factors is absent (or has zero value), the product of the

multiplication will be zero, namely no leadership. This assumption has yet to be examined empirically, although it has been raised in the past (Popper, 1994, p. 125) on the basis of common sense. On the other hand, it may be argued that while one or two of the components (almost certainly potential and motivation) are essential for leadership, the third (development) is possible and additive, but not essential. This, then, is the aim of the present research: to examine the nature of the relationship between the three components. At the same time, the research assumption is that all three components are required in the leadership process and that the absence of one of them will invalidate the equation, in other words, will not produce effective leadership.

The P constituent in the leadership formula ($P \times M \times D$) refers to the totality of basic characteristics and capacities existing in the individual at a given time and constituting a necessary basis for his/her ability to function as a leader. We claim that only a person with enough ego strength can convey feelings of confidence and direction to the followers and thus become a leader. We chose to use the term “potential” in order to emphasize that the existence of these capacities is a necessary but not a sufficient condition. This potential is represented in the present research by five major capacities: the first is high **self efficacy**. People with high self efficacy believe in their ability to perform tasks successfully, to cope with difficulties and achieve their aims (Bandura, 1977). The second capacity required of a leader is an internal **locus of control**. This refers to the way in which people perceive their ability to control events. Individuals with an internal locus of control believe that they are able to control events, that they can influence and change events by their decisions and actions, as opposed to those with an external locus of control, who believe that external factors (such as luck or fate) are more powerful, and therefore they do not attempt to exert influence or generate change (Rotter, 1966). The third capacity required of a leader is a low level of **trait anxiety**. People who are prone to anxiety cannot occupy a leadership position that requires them to deal with stressful situations and to use their influence on others (Cattell & Scheier, 1963).

The three capacities mentioned so far focus on the internal psychological strengths of the individual, but since the social aspect is dominant in the leadership phenomenon, it is also necessary to take into account the dimension of social relations when examining an individual's leadership potential. In our opinion, a person who can serve in a leadership position is one who feels secure and comfortable in forming social ties; in terms of attachment theory (Bowlby, 1969), a person with a secure **attachment style**. Developments of attachment theory have been applied to the examination of attachment patterns among adults (Hazan & Shaver, 1987) and among leaders (Popper, Mayseless & Castelnovo, 2000). And finally, the leader needs an **optimistic approach** to life. Optimists tend to believe that their lives will, on the whole, include more positive than negative experiences (Scheier & Carver, 1985). People characterized by optimistic thinking are better able to present a vision, a goal, or a new direction to their followers, they are more convinced of the prospects of success, and thus able to sweep the others along with them (Berson et al., 2001; Popper & Mayseless, 2002;2003).

These capacities, which will be expanded on later, constitute the individual's “ego resources” or leadership potential. Various studies have indicated the link between each of these components and leadership (Howell & Avolio, 1993; Castelnovo, 1996; Smith & Foti, 1998; Chemers, Watson & May, 2000; Katz, 2001). In the present research, these components are examined empirically, on the assumption that they represent the individual's ego strengths and ability to be a leader.ⁱ

However, as stated, an individual with leadership potential will not necessarily become a leader: that individual must also want to lead, must have motivation to lead. The concept “motivation to lead” is fairly new in leadership literature. Although it is clear that such motivation is required in the leadership process, few scholars have attempted to examine the concept empirically. Chan (1999) and Chan and Drasgow (2001) constructed a model describing motivation to lead. They claim that the individual’s motivation to lead may stem from three sources: affective, representing a strong inner urge on the part of the individual to wield influence and be in charge; reward, which represents the benefit that the individual wishes to achieve from the leadership status; and social-normative, relating to the social expectations acting on the individual. The sources of motivation described by Chan and associates were examined empirically by a questionnaire they developed among a Singaporean-American sample, and it was found that these three sources do indeed exist. We have added another factor to this questionnaire, relating to ideological sources of motivation. Beyond this cognitive work, Popper and Mayseless (2001) suggest examining the developmental sources of motivation to lead. They claim that these sources stem from events in early childhood and relate to issues such as the child’s birth order in the family and the parents’ expectations. We will examine this explanation indirectly through an analysis of the developmental component (D) in the leadership formula. Also, since we are discussing an Israeli military framework, we will examine a number of additional questions pertaining specifically to our subjects’ motivation to achieve a status of command in the course of their military service (to be a commander or an officer).

The third, and most complicated, component in the proposed leadership formula, is development. In our view, leadership formation is a developmental process. The individual does not become a leader overnight but develops as one from early childhood. This process includes experiences of leadership to which the individual is exposed in the course of his/her life, but he or she has to be open to these experiences and grow from them. Openness to experience is one of the personality dimensions in the “five factor” approach (the Big Five), and includes characteristics such as a broad range of interests, curiosity, originality, imagination, and intellectual interest. Openness to experience has been found to be related to leadership (Keller, 1999). This developmental view of the leadership process is compatible with a study by Avolio and Gibbons (1988), who claim that leadership is a developmental phenomenon related to the parents’ expectations, the family conditions in which the child grew up, leadership experiences and opportunities to which they were exposed, the influence of leaders, the individual’s general developmental orientation, and finally, their ability to cope with their emotions, failures and experiences. The model proposed by Avolio and Gibbons (1988) links the developmental family-related and experiential component with the openness and personal growth of the individual, and we will examine this model and develop it in the context of the early stages of leadership development in the military.

In light of all the above, the aim of this effort is to examine the phenomenon of leadership with the help of the following formula: leadership is a function of a given potential (P), motivation to lead (M), leadership development and personal growth (D). Examination of the relationships between the three constituents of the formula is one of the major aims of this research.

In the following chapters we will describe each of the components in the proposed leadership formula, presenting the theoretical argument underlying each component and discussing research findings relevant to these components, and finally we will formulate our own research hypotheses.

Chapter 1. Potential to lead

Leadership research began with the attempt to identify the traits and characteristics of the leader. The many studies conducted in the spirit of the trait approach did not yield a clear profile of the leader, nor did they succeed in locating a number of basic traits common to leaders. Those studies focused on salient external characteristics as well as on personality traits. A review of the findings reveals a complex picture in which one may find dozens of possible characteristics of leaders, but these findings are not consistent, and contradictions were found between studies with regard to the same characteristics (Bass, 1990). The inconsistency in the findings of various studies conducted according to the trait approach led in the end to its abandonment and to the adoption of approaches that ignored the leader's characteristics.

Nevertheless, an examination of contemporary research on leadership indicates a certain tendency to reopen the discussion on aspects of the leader's personality (Gerstner & Day, 1994; Smith & Foti, 1998; Chemers, Watson & May, 2000; Judge & Bono, 2000; Chan & Drasgow, 2001; Judge et al., 2002; McCormack & Mellor, 2002). It should be noted, however, that the discussion has changed and expanded to include new psychological concepts that have been developed in recent decades, such as self efficacy. Also, the leader's personality traits in these studies are not examined separately but integrated with other aspects related to leadership development. The present effort, following this trend, examines the leader's abilities as part of a range of internal, motivational and developmental characteristics that lead to his/her emergence as a leader.

What, then, are the major abilities that we expect to find in a leader, or in other words, what abilities compose the leader's potential? The decision to focus on certain abilities or characteristics stems from the understanding that leadership is above all a process of **influencing** and guiding others. Indeed, the predominant definitions of "leadership" in academic research refer to influence as a major factor (e.g., Minzberg, 1973; Kotter, 1990, 1996). Thus, leaders are those who have the ability to influence others and guide them forward (Gal, 1987; Popper, 1994, 1999). In our view, only a person with relevant and sufficient ego strength and a positive self image is suitable for this task. Bass (1985) refers to one of the major characteristics that are found in a leader – **self confidence**. To strengthen this claim, Bass cites research findings that support the link between leadership and self confidence (Kipnis & Lane, 1962; Mowday, 1979). However, this argument was not developed conceptually and did not become central in leadership research (Popper, 2000). To examine our argument concerning the "potential" component, we chose to develop Bass's argument and examine four concepts related to self confidence that we would expect to find among leaders: a high level of self efficacy, internal locus of control, a low level of trait anxiety, and a secure pattern of social attachment. The last concept, a secure attachment pattern, is indirectly related to self confidence and refers to the leader's ability to be in non-dependent relationships with others while giving and listening to the other (Popper & Mayseless, 2002;2003). In addition, we chose to examine a characteristic related to leaders' ability to give their followers direction and vision. This characteristic is optimism. We hypothesize that a person with self confidence and an optimistic view has the basic potential to become a leader. The following sections will relate to each of the components of leadership potential.

1.1 Self efficacy

The concept of self efficacy was developed at the end of the 1970s by Bandura, who defined it as the individual's belief in his/her ability to successfully perform the behaviors required in order to achieve

an anticipated goal (Bandura, 1977, 1986, 1995). This self concept of the individual is formed in the context of behaviors and develops gradually in an ongoing learning process, during which the individual gathers information from various sources with regard to his/her ability to function in certain spheres. Bandura (1977) describes three major dimensions by which to measure an individual's self efficacy. The first dimension is magnitude. This refers to the difficulty of the task that the individual is required to perform. People with high self efficacy believe that they are capable of performing even the most difficult tasks. The second dimension is strength. This relates to the level of the individual's confidence in his/her ability to perform tasks successfully. The third dimension is generalizability, the degree to which the individual's self efficacy in a specific area extends to other areas, or in other words, how far they generalize their success or failure in performing a particular task to the performance of other tasks in the future.

According to Bandura (1977, 1986), self efficacy is formed in an ongoing learning process, during which individuals acquire knowledge concerning their abilities from four main sources: the first and most important of these sources is their past experiences of success and failure. Success in performing tasks raises one's self efficacy, while failure lowers it (Bandura, 1986). Secondly, people learn from observing the behaviors of others and may adopt behavioral models for imitation. Thirdly, the individual's self efficacy may be influenced by verbal persuasion from others with regard to the ability to perform tasks. And finally, people's physiological condition during task performance affects their self efficacy with regard to the task to be performed. Thus, at least the first three sources (previous experience, observation and imitation of others, feedback and persuasion from others) are related to individuals' development over the years from early childhood, and to the degree of their exposure and openness to transformative experiences. This fact will be dealt with in the context of the development variables (D) in our research.

Bandura (1977, 1986, 1995) claims that self efficacy has motivational and functional implications. People's beliefs regarding their ability affect the way they perform a task, the amount of effort they choose to devote to the task, and their determination and persistence in performing it. This belief also affects the choices they make. People choose tasks that seem to them to be achievable and in the range of their ability, and therefore an individual's self efficacy is usually self-validating. For example, it was found that self efficacy in a professional area predicts choice of that profession and choice of subjects for university study (Hackett & Betz, 1995).

While Bandura's first definition of self efficacy focused on individuals' belief in their ability to perform a specific task, the definition was later broadened by Bandura and others. It was suggested that self efficacy should be seen as a general characteristic, representing individuals' belief regarding their capability of reaching achievements in various spheres and performing a range of tasks well (Eden, 1988, 1996; Hackett & Betz, 1995; Gardner & Pierce, 1998). This broader view led to a distinction between situational self efficacy and general, or trait, self efficacy. Situational self efficacy refers to individuals' perception of their ability to perform a specific task, a perception that may change in different situations. General self efficacy (GSE), on the other hand, relates to people's beliefs regarding their general permanent level of ability to perform a broad range of tasks in a variety of situations (Shelton, 1990; Eden, 1996).

The connection between self efficacy and the ability to lead seems self evident. People who believe in themselves and in their capacity to perform tasks successfully will be more suitable for leadership

roles than those who do not believe in themselves. Studies show that this belief in oneself is significant in the context of leadership. Gibbons (1986) analyzed leaders' development from childhood to maturity through a series of personal interviews. It emerges from these studies that one of the significant factors in the development of the individual's leadership ability is his/her self efficacy, which develops and evolves in the course of his/her life through experiences of success. The importance of self efficacy among leaders also stands out in the research of Kotter (1990, 1996) and in a series of studies dealing with self efficacy, intelligence, and leadership (Chemers, 2002; Murphy, 2002). Smith and Foti's (1998) study was the first that attempted to examine directly the link between the concept of general self efficacy (GSE) and the emergence of leaders in a group. For prediction of the emergence of leaders in a group, Smith and Foti examined the influence of three characteristics: dominance, intelligence, and general self efficacy. Of the three, general self efficacy was found to be most highly correlated with grading and evaluation of leadership in a group. In contrast to that study, which was based on the view of self efficacy as a personality trait, some new leadership studies have attempted to confine the concept of self efficacy to the realm of leadership, developing a more specific concept – "self efficacy to lead" (Chan, 1999; Chemers, Watson & May, 2000). The findings of these studies, too, indicate the importance of individuals' belief in their own leadership ability and its link with their growth as leaders. An outstanding element in these studies is the significant link between self efficacy to lead and motivation to lead.

Since the present research seeks to examine the major capacities that constitute the individual's leadership potential, we wish to see the individual's self efficacy as a stable characteristic that goes beyond the leadership context. Similarly, since one of the variables that compose the leadership formula proposed in our effort is motivation to lead, we wish to reduce the dependence between this and the variables of potential. The significant link found in motivation studies between motivation to lead and self efficacy to lead may, in fact, detract from the model proposed in the present research. In this light, like Smith and Foti (1998), we will examine the general self efficacy of the individual.

Research hypothesis 1: Higher levels of general self efficacy will be found among subjects perceived as "leaders" than among those perceived as "non-leaders."

1.2 Locus of control

The concept "locus of control" was first defined by Rotter (1966) and relates to the way in which people perceive their ability or inability to control events. While those with an internal locus of control believe that they have the ability to control and influence events, and therefore the outcome of their behavior depends on their ability and skills, those with an external locus of control believe that events are controlled by external factors (luck, fate, the difficulty of the tasks), hence the outcome of their behavior depends on other people, on luck, or on other external factors.

Studies that examined this concept found it to be a personality variable rather than a situational one (Lefcourt, 1966; Pharse, 1976). These studies and others, using a scale developed by Rotter (1966), attempted to characterize the personality profile of those with an external locus of control as distinct from those with an internal locus of control. It was found that individuals with an external locus of control are characterized by conservatism, a relatively high level of anxiety, passivity, a lower level of personal responsibility, difficulty in coping with the environment and a tendency to be defensive. Those with an internal locus of control, on the other hand, reveal independence, achievement orientation, diligence, resourcefulness, nonconformity, political

awareness and involvement, and a high personal level of commitment and responsibility (Lipman, 1980; Phaser, 1980). In addition, those with an internal locus of control are perceived as more active in their endeavors to change and shape their environment (Phares, Ritchie & Davis, 1968). A series of studies that examined locus of control among managers found that managers with an internal locus of control showed more self confidence in their ability to influence their environment, were better capable of coping with stressful situations, tended to adopt more innovative and daring organizational strategies, and in the end achieved higher organizational performance than managers with an external locus of control (Anderson, 1977; Miller, Kets de Vries & Toulouse, 1982; Miller & Toulouse, 1986).

While many studies use the concept of locus of control to examine managers' characteristics and performances, there are scarcely any studies examining locus of control in the context of leadership, although it is related conceptually to self confidence, and the link to leadership appears self-evident. Howell and Avolio (1993) were the first to examine locus of control among managers in the context of transactional and transformational leadership.ⁱⁱ Their findings indicate the existence of a statistically significant positive relation between the indices of transformational leadership and higher levels of internal locus of control. These authors note that it is important to continue examining this key concept in the context of leadership. Hence, the present research will examine empirically whether locus of control helps to distinguish between "leaders" and "non-leaders."

Research hypothesis 2: Higher levels of internal locus of control will be found among subjects perceived as "leaders" than among those perceived as "non-leaders."

The concepts "locus of control" and "self efficacy" belong to the family of concepts dealing with self control and self confidence, and therefore the question arises as to whether they are distinct from each other or whether what is examined is, in fact, the same concept. According to Peterson and Stunkard (1992), locus of control and self efficacy are two separate concepts, although they may be interconnected. While locus of control relates to one's general expectations with regard to the source of causes and results in the world, self efficacy refers to one's belief in one's own ability to behave in a certain way. People may have self efficacy with regard to their ability to implement certain behaviors, regardless of their locus of control. Each of these concepts, according to Peterson and Stunkard (1992), represents a different degree of abstraction and generalization. Self efficacy is related directly to behavior, while locus of control is related to more general thoughts and beliefs. They argue that the two concepts should be examined concurrently for optimal prediction of behavior. Bandura (1977, 1997) rejects the explanation that the difference between the concepts stems from different levels of generalization, arguing that they are two entirely different concepts. Beliefs relating to the question as to whether a person can perform a certain action (self efficacy) differ from beliefs concerning the question as to whether certain actions will influence the results (locus of control). The picture obtained from studies that examined these two concepts empirically is not a uniform one. Some point to a significant positive relation between the two concepts (Stanley & Murphy, 1997), while others indicate a weak link between them (Smith, 1989). In the present effort both concepts will be examined empirically in the context of leadership, and the connection between them will be investigated empirically.

1.3 Anxiety

Anxiety is an emotional condition involving a subjective experience of fear and terror (Lewis, 1970). Moderate levels of anxiety, accompanied by suspicion and caution, may sometimes indicate psychological and psycho-social tendencies of the individual to avoid dangerous projects (Endler, 1980; Beck & Emery, 1985). However, when high levels of anxiety appear frequently, there may be significant damage to the individual's ability to function. The distinction between "state anxiety" and "trait anxiety" (Spielberger, 1972; Endler, 1980) is highly relevant to the present effort. State anxiety is defined as a temporary emotional state that appears in response to a frightening or stressful situation. In contrast, trait anxiety, as its name indicates, represents an immanent predisposition of an individual manifested in response to a large variety of situations. People with trait anxiety will have difficulty functioning effectively when exposed to stressors and conditions of uncertainty. Such people feel that they do not have the necessary tools to cope with events, a feeling that generates high tension (Sarason, 1975). Thus, trait anxiety may be clearly related to a low level of self confidence. The distinction between these two types of anxiety led to the development of tools for measuring state and trait anxiety (Cattell & Scheier, 1960; Spielberger, 1972).

Since leadership requires self confidence and resilience, it may be assumed that an individual with trait anxiety will not be found in a leadership position. On the contrary, it may be hypothesized that people characterized as leaders will have a very low level of trait anxiety. Despite the clear connection, the variable of trait anxiety has scarcely been examined in the context of leadership, with the outstanding exception of a study recently conducted among students in a military academy in Israel (Katz, 2001), which found lower levels of trait anxiety among students defined as "leaders" than among those defined as "non-leaders."

Research hypothesis 3: Among the subjects examined, lower levels of trait anxiety will be found in those defined as "leaders" than in those defined as "non-leaders."

1.4 Attachment

The three capacities discussed so far – high self efficacy, internal locus of control, and low level of trait anxiety – focus on the inner psychological strengths of the individual. But since the social aspect is a central part of the leadership phenomenon, the social dimension must also be taken into account when examining an individual's leadership potential. In our opinion, only a person who feels secure and comfortable in forming social relationships can serve in a leadership position. A theory that deals with social relationships, and has been developed to apply to leadership relations, is Bowlby's attachment theory (1969, 1973, 1988). According to Bowlby, one of the baby's primary needs is the need for attachment and proximity. The satisfaction of this need depends on the baby's ability to communicate his/her desire for warmth, proximity and care, and on the adult's parallel ability to identify these messages and respond to them with sensitivity. A baby who feels safe and protected has a secure base, and can explore the environment independently, in the knowledge that there is a safe haven to return to. The caregiver's ability to balance the baby's needs for both dependence and autonomy molds an unconscious psychological structure in the baby – an internal working model – which, in turn, molds the child's future emotional and social development. This structure has two complementary sides: self-perception (worthy of love or worthless) and perception of the surroundings (accessible and loving or inaccessible and unloving). According to Bowlby, there is continuity between the primary experience of attachment and the experience of attachment in later stages of life.

Ainsworth and associates (1978) developed a laboratory paradigm for the examination of attachment theory – the “stranger situation,” permitting classification of babies into three main attachment styles: secure, anxious/ambivalent, and avoidant. A broad range of studies testifies that these internal models are stable at least during the child’s early years (e.g., Kaplan & Main, 1985; Cassidy, 1994,1999). This stability implies that the attachment style in infancy, which is perceived as characterizing a specific relationship, becomes a part of the personality through a process of internalization during the child’s later development. This understanding paved the way for research on attachment among adults. Hazan and Shaver (1987) developed a method of measuring attachment styles among adults through a self report questionnaire, and examined the relationship between romantic love and attachment style. The research showed a correlation between a secure attachment style and many positive characteristics of close relationships and romantic ties, including intimacy and trust in the partner, conflict resolution by integration and compromise, and self confidence and self esteem. In contrast, a relation was found between an anxious/ambivalent attachment style and emotional fluctuations, jealousy, and low self esteem. An avoidant attachment style was found to be related to fear of intimacy and low levels of trust and commitment to relationships. These findings are compatible with the findings of studies on attachment in infancy, and they are also consistent in the distribution of subjects according to attachment styles (Shaver & Hazan, 1993). It was found that the distribution of attachment styles in the adult population can be characterized as follows: secure style - 62%, anxious style - 15%, and avoidant style - 23% (in Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Thus Hazan and Shaver expanded the idea of the internal working model in adulthood to the nature of the relationships formed between adults.

In recent years we have witnessed some attempts at empirical examination of attachment theory in the context of leadership. Mikulincer and Florian (1995), in a study on Soldiers in basic training, found a link between the attachment styles of the subjects - young draftees - and their colleagues’ evaluation regarding their suitability to be commanders: “secure” and “avoidant” Soldiers were graded higher in leadership than “anxious/ambivalent” Soldiers. Popper, Mayseless and Castelnovo (2000) examined the link between transformational leadership and attachment style in a series of three studies. In the first study, police officer cadets were evaluated by their team commanders with regard to leadership style (according to Bass’s scale, 1985) and attachment style. In the second study, the leadership style of officer cadets in the border police was evaluated by their officers, similarly to the first study, while their attachment style was evaluated by self reports. In the third study, the leadership style of platoon commanders in IDF combat units was evaluated by their subordinates, and their attachment style was evaluated by self report questionnaires. In all three studies a positive relation was found between a secure attachment style and transformational leadership.

Bowlby’s attachment theory, and its later theoretical and empirical development, may provide a rich and relevant theoretical basis for the study of leadership development. Popper, Mayseless and Castelnovo (2000) developed a conceptual framework that links a secure attachment style with transformational leadership. Their assumption is that in order to be a transformational leader the individual has to have a positive self concept as well as a positive view of those around him/her. In the present research, we wish to examine whether the Soldiers who are perceived as leaders in their companies are those with a secure attachment style. Our assumption is that the ability to form comfortable social ties and feel secure in one’s relations with those around is part of one’s leadership

potential. In this context it is important to note that as we are observing Soldiers at the beginning of their military service, we cannot at these early stages examine whether they are transformational leaders. However, we assume that they are “socialized” (positive) rather than “personalized” (negative) leaders, in the light of findings of research conducted in the IDF, which found a low percentage of “personalized” leaders among those perceived as leaders by their friends and commanders (Neeman-Nagor, 1998).

Research hypothesis 4: There will be a higher rate of individuals with a secure attachment style among those defined as “leaders” than among those defined as “non-leaders.”

1.5 Optimism

Optimism is defined as individuals’ tendency to believe that generally speaking they will have more positive than negative experiences in their lifetime (Scheier & Carver, 1985). Optimistic thinking has been found to have a positive effect on people’s emotions and behavior, and on the extent to which they are prepared to devote efforts to achieve their aims during stressful periods. Optimism is defined as a personality characteristic that is stable beyond time and place, and not limited to a specific context (Snyder et al., 1991). There are even some who claim that optimism is not an acquired personality characteristic but a hereditary one (Plomin et al., 1992).

Research indicates behavioral and personality differences that distinguish between optimists and pessimists. According to Scheier and Carver (1993), optimists will make great efforts to achieve an aim, even if the road is slow or hard, as opposed to pessimists, who will give up or avoid acting in such circumstances. These authors also found that optimistic subjects differed from pessimistic subjects in the various behavioral strategies they used in coping with a stressful situation. Optimism was found to be related to the need to act, to plan and to use the coping strategy of “focusing on the problem,” and attempting to make the best of a given situation, as well as more actively seeking social support. In contrast, a negative correlation was found between optimism and the tendency to avoid or deny problems (Scheier & Carver, 1986).

Optimism was also found to be a significant indicator of mental well-being. Optimistic subjects report that they have more interest in life and feel greater satisfaction with their work and their social relationships. In addition, they feel freer from pressures and calmer in their everyday life. Along with this, they feel less stress, depression, anxiety and hostility (Scheier & Carver, 1993). Thus, optimism is in negative relation to anxiety. Optimism also helps in coping with stressful situations through its influence on cognitive organization, on the assessment of threat and the sense of control of the anticipated outcomes of the event, and on the behavior strategies employed. Since stress is the result of the perceived extent of the threat together with the sense of inability to cope with it, optimism was found to be capable of reducing stress due to its effect on the cognitive organization of the individual, who estimates that s/he is able to control the situation. Subjects who perceived stressful events as controllable and had positive expectations with regard to their future functioning showed lower levels of depression, anxiety and distress, and developed less symptoms of stress (Lazarus, Kanner & Folkman, 1980).

A number of studies dealing with the link between leadership and optimism point to a correlation between the two. One of the personality traits attributed to leaders is the ability to present a vision, a future goal or a new direction. In order to present a future orientation, formulate it in terms of a

vision, and also to be convinced of its prospects of success and thus to sweep the others along, a person must be optimistic. Optimistic leaders have the ability to demonstrate enthusiasm concerning their vision, to inspire others and exert a positive influence on their followers (House & House, 2000; Popper & Mayseless 2002;2003). A study examining optimism and pessimism among leaders in the business sector found that optimism predicts the ability to create a shared vision and encourage action through emotion. The explanation lies in the fact that optimistic leaders are capable of having a positive influence over their followers (Wunderley et al., 1998). Berson and associates (2001) examined the link between leadership style and the content of the vision presented by the leader. They found that a transformational leadership style among 141 leaders predicted the strength of the vision as expressed in its level of optimism. In other words, leaders whose vision was optimistic and full of confidence were identified as transformational leaders and as those with more influence in the organization. These results remained constant when the size of the organization was added as a moderating factor. The findings support the fact that these leaders are described in the literature as more optimistic, more secure and more target-oriented. This is also manifested in the manner in which the vision is presented: an inspiring vision has to be optimistic, it must express confidence, emphasize the internal needs, be connected to the values of the organization, and emphasize future challenges and new opportunities in a positive light. The “strength of the vision” is measured by the quantity of such inspiring components.

While the studies reviewed above, examining the link between optimism and leadership, focused on transformational leadership, other studies have examined this subject in the broader context of leadership. George (2000) examined leader's effectiveness by five major elements, among them the ability to create and maintain enthusiasm, confidence, optimism, cooperation and trust. She claims that leaders with these qualities are more effective because their perceptions and evaluations are more positive: they are more sure of themselves, tend to take credit for successes and avoid blaming themselves for failures; in addition, they tend to help others. She adds that leaders should know how to present a vision, be confident that they can solve problems, and be optimistic concerning their abilities and their personal contribution. Leaders with high emotional intelligence are more likely to arouse enthusiasm and optimism and elicit cooperation and trust, which in turn will lead to the development of interpersonal relationships with the followers.

In another study, Chemers, Watson and May (2000) claim that self efficacy, like optimism, is related to high levels of motivation, inspiration, goal orientation, persistence in the face of difficulties, and enthusiasm, which bring the leader to devote greater and more long lasting endeavors in order to achieve the aims of the group. These feelings are apt to draw in the followers, affecting their confidence and their world view. In their study, these authors reported a link between optimism and leadership potential among cadets. The cadets' potential was evaluated by military experts based on acquaintance with them at college (2-3 years) and examined in a variety of situations. The study found that optimism plays an important part in the growth of leadership in an ongoing situation, but is not a significant factor in the case of a specific situation located in a particular time and place (e.g., a training camp). In the light of the above, the research hypothesis is:

Research hypothesis 5: A higher level of optimism will be found among subjects perceived as “leaders” than among those perceived as “non-leaders.”

1.6 Conclusion

Thus far, we have presented the five major capacities that we would expect to find in a leader. These five capacities, in our view, comprise the main leadership potential of the individual. While the first four represent different internal and social aspects of self confidence, the fifth represents the leader's outlook on life and relates to the understanding that the leader provides the followers with a direction and a vision. We chose to restrict the number of variables in our research to the five described above, both for methodological reasons (e.g., to limit the number of independent variables), and in light of research findings that point to these variables as particularly relevant to leadership, findings which match our own extensive experience in the area of leadership development.

In conclusion, the research hypotheses pertaining to the element of potential in the leadership formula are:

1. *Higher levels of general self efficacy will be found among subjects perceived as “leaders” than among those perceived as “non-leaders.”*
2. *Higher levels of internal locus of control will be found among subjects perceived as “leaders” than among those perceived as “non-leaders.”*
3. *Lower levels of trait anxiety will be found in subjects defined as “leaders” than in those defined as “non-leaders.”*
4. *There will be a higher rate of individuals with a secure attachment style among those defined as “leaders” than among those defined as “non-leaders.”*
5. *A higher level of optimism will be found among subjects perceived as “leaders” than among those perceived as “non-leaders.”*

Chapter 2. Motivation to lead

The concept “motivation to lead” is fairly new in leadership literature. Only a few studies have attempted to address this subject conceptually and empirically, and explore the motives that lead the individual to attempt to reach and hold on to a leadership position. While leadership potential is more easily measurable, for example, by judges’ evaluation and personality measures, motivation to lead is harder to measure empirically.

There have recently been attempts to examine and characterize motivation to lead, particularly by constructing a set of predictions that can explain the various sources of motivation to lead (Chan, 1999). The purpose was to gain a better understanding of the leadership phenomenon in general, and to understand the effect of the various motivational factors on the emergence of effective leadership behavior in particular. In the present field effort we seek to contribute to the sparse knowledge existing on the subject by empirical examination of Soldiers’ motivation to serve in leadership roles. Before moving on to a description of the innovative model proposed by Chan (1999), we will review some more general theories on motivation, as well as motivation theories that can be related specifically to the area of motivation to lead.

2.1 Motivational theories

Motivation is defined as complex internal processes that predict three aspects of behavior: direction, strength and continuity (Kanfer, 1990). Campbell and Pritchard (1976) explain the components of motivation:

1. The decision to devote efforts to a certain task (direction)
2. The decision to initiate investment in that task (strength)
3. The decision to continue investing time and energy over a long period (persistence).

Early contributions to the concept of motivation came mainly from philosophical theories dealing with the nature of people’s endeavors to satisfy their needs within their environment (Popper & Ronen, 1989). The psychological theories that developed in the 20th century embrace the assumption that motivation represents a factor that drives people towards a certain goal that causes them pleasure or leads them to avoid painful experiences (physical or mental). Various psychological theories discuss the concept of motivation, emphasizing diverse aspects. Physiological theories focus on different mechanisms that arouse basic motivation (e.g., hunger, thirst, sex, or addiction). Behaviorist theories emphasize motivational factors that constitute positive or negative reinforcements for achieving certain goals (Skinner, 1953). In psychodynamic theories the emphasis is on urges and needs that motivate humans (Freud, 1917).

A major theory, which attempts to comprise in one model a number of motivational factors proposed by the various psychological theories, is Maslow’s (1954) hierarchy of needs. According to Maslow, humans do not have one fundamental need from which all the others derive, but rather basic and higher needs. Only when the basic needs are satisfied is the individual free to aspire to a higher need, which serves as a new source of motivation. This can be presented in the form of a “pyramid” or hierarchy, with the needs arranged from the more basic to the higher needs. The need for self-actualization, which expresses the human’s supreme aspiration, and the ability to realize their maximum potential, is reached only after all the other needs are satisfied. Maslow’s theory, although it was basically therapy-oriented, also had an impact on social psychology, and the issue of “self

actualization”, seeing people as acting to achieve aims in their social framework, became a central factor in motivation research. Herzberg (1966), for example, claimed that people have two needs factors in their work: “hygienic needs”, such as the physical work conditions, and “motivational needs”, such as achievement, appreciation, interpersonal relations, advancement, and personal development.

The question as to what factors lead an individual to act to achieve a certain aim naturally led to the question: how can a person be motivated to achieve a certain aim? This question is highly relevant to everyday life, particularly in organizations that wish to maximize their workers’ ability and harness them to achieve the aims of the organization. Traditionally, the manager was perceived as a leader who was supposed to lead the workers towards achievement of the aim, and therefore until recently most of the motivation theories dealing with leadership (either directly, or indirectly by dealing with motivation related to management) focused mainly on the question of how the leader motivates his/her followers to act. In other words, what needs of the followers does the leader provide in order to move them towards a certain aim? The transformational leadership approach (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985), which was mentioned in the introduction, also stems from this approach and emphasizes the leader’s importance as a motivation-arousing factor. Through intellectual stimulation, charisma, human relations, and above all motivating inspiration, the leader brings the followers to see the aim of the organization as their personal aim, and to aspire to achieve it as a personal challenge. (For a review and comparison of these and other theories, see Landy & Becker, 1987; Popper & Ronen, 1989; Lee & Earley, 1992).

2.2 Theories pertaining to motivation to lead

Surprisingly few studies have examined the motivational factors that lead a person to attempt to reach and hold a leadership position. This desire seems to be a universal one, and people attempt to become leaders in many spheres of life in order to acquire power, respect or prestige, although the position of leader is often hard and demands personal sacrifice (Harris, 1991). We see this in everyday life in people’s attempts to reach positions of power in government, in the military, in business, and elsewhere.

Much of the research on motivation to lead was largely theoretical until quite recently. Many of the studies were based on dynamic-developmental principles, particularly the compensation principle (e.g., Adler). Zaleznik (1992) argues that the urge to be a leader is rooted in the wish to be born again, or as he calls it, “twice-born”, and to change things related to the first birth. According to Zaleznik, the biography of many great leaders is characterized by the absence of a father, either in the physical sense (death or absence from home), or in the psychological sense, when the father is remote, alienated or exploitative. A similar argument is used by Burns (1978). In reviewing the psycho-biographies of leaders, Burns argues that in the absence of the father the Oedipal conflict is intensified, the boy undertakes the father’s role and becomes “his own father.”

Popper (1998, 1999) attempted to examine the motivational differences in the development of two types of charismatic leaders: personalized and socialized. Personalized charismatic leaders are characterized by negative and destructive leadership, based on their personal interest in occupying the leadership position as a major source for satisfaction of their need for adoration (Popper cites as examples Hitler, Jim Jones and Charles Manson). Socialized charismatic leaders, on the other hand,

listen to others, see themselves through the other and see the other through themselves, have the followers' well-being at heart, and are dedicated to the good of the society that they lead.

One of the problems connected with these dynamic theories is that they focus on exceptional leadership rather than on leadership in everyday life. Another problem relates to the difficulty in conducting empirical research on the population at large. However, a number of recent studies have attempted an empirical examination of the relations proposed in these theories. For example, Popper found that personalized charismatic leaders are in positive correlation with the measure of narcissism, while socialized charismatic leaders are in negative correlation with this measure, which appears to support the theory he proposes (Popper, 1999).

Another major approach with an empirical focus was suggested by McClelland (1975), who developed an analysis system based on the TAT. Using this system he reached the conclusion that behavior can be explained by three major motives:

1. Need for power – the need to have emotional and material influence over others.
2. Need for achievement – the need to succeed by one's own endeavors and self fulfillment.
3. Need for affiliation – the need to gain the acceptance and recognition of others.

In addition, McClelland (1975) postulates the existence of activity inhibition, a factor defined by the quantity of inhibitions that the individual possesses concerning the use of power. This is a factor of self control. McClelland and associates investigated the motives of managers at various levels in large organizations (McClelland, 1975; McClelland & Burnham, 1976; McClelland & Boyatzis, 1982), and reached the conclusion that there is a leadership motivation pattern, which characterizes the most effective managers at high levels in organizations. This pattern is characterized by at least a moderate level of need for power (explained by the manager's wish to influence his/her environment), a low level of need for admiration (permitting the manager to make unpopular decisions if necessary), and a high level of activity inhibition (enabling the manager to preserve the organizational framework). This pattern was found to be effective in large organizations, but not necessarily in small ones. For example, it was found that a high need for achievement has a positive effect on the ability of managers in small organizations, while it appears to be an obstacle in large organizations, since it is liable to detract from the manager's overall view of the system.

McClelland's innovation was the attempt to categorize the motives that could discriminate between successful and unsuccessful managers by using a structured empirical approach. However, his approach was criticized for its psychometric weakness – the use of a non-standard projective tool for discrimination (Brief, Aldag & Chacko, 1976). In addition, there was no systematic attempt to examine different profiles of leadership motivation factors, but simply an attempt to find a leadership pattern common to all managers. Another difficulty was the absence of a developmental perspective in order to try to understand the source of the various motives found in the studies.

2.2.1 Chan's MTL (motivation to lead) model

Chan and Drasgow (2001) define motivation to lead as differences in the personality structure which influence the decision of the leader (or future leader), to undertake leadership roles with their attendant responsibility, and which affect the intensity of the efforts and persistence during leadership. This definition emphasizes the existence of interpersonal differences in people's reasons for wanting to lead, and the possible influence of these differences on leadership behaviors.

According to Chan (1999), until recently most leadership theories concentrated on the final criterion (namely, the emergence of leadership behavior), and paid less attention to explaining the secondary criteria (such as motivation to lead), that lead to the final criterion. In addition, he argues that leadership theories often ignored the complexity of these secondary criteria, which are influenced by more fundamental elements such as personality traits, tendencies and values. Therefore, says Chan, they ignored interpersonal differences between these elements, which influence every developmental process conducive to the emergence of leadership behavior. Chan proposes a theory that describes integration between predictors of leadership (both basic and secondary criteria), emphasizing interpersonal differences and placing at its center motivation to lead (MTL). He claims that leadership behavior should be seen as a process combining several elements: MTL, specific tendencies and capacities, acquisition of new leadership experiences and skills, cognitive ability, acquisition of social skills and knowledge. All these combine to form “personal resources”, which help the individual (given situational factors) to practice leadership behavior. The principles of this model are based on social learning theory (Bandura, 1986), and Chan sees the process as a virtuous circle that feeds itself in the course of the individual’s development.

As stated, motivation to lead is the core of Chan’s proposed model. This motivation stems from four major components: personality traits, values, leadership self efficacy, and previous experiences of leadership. Since these components differ from one person to another, both in strength and nature, and exist in interaction with the environment, it may be anticipated that they will be related to diverse MTL factors (namely, different motivations to lead). Furthermore, since some of the components of MTL are stable (personality traits and values), it may also be assumed that the factorial structure will remain relatively stable, although it may change over time as a result of new leadership experiences that affect the level of leadership self efficacy and the MTL in general.

To determine the dominant factors in the individual’s wish to lead, Chan used two social-cognitive theories dealing with structures that predict intended and actual leadership behavior: Fishbein & Ajzen’s (1975) theory of reasoned action (TRA) and Triandis’s (1977) interpersonal behavior theory. These theories identify some major structures that are associated with behavior: values related to action (affective structure), beliefs regarding results of action (calculative structure), and social norms related to action (social structure). Therefore, Chan argued that one can discern three MTL factors:

- 1st. Affective motivation to lead (AMTL). Here the individual is motivated to lead out of an inner desire, as a result of satisfaction and pleasure that s/he derives from being in a leadership position.
- 2nd. Social-normative motivation to lead (SNMTL). Here the person is motivated to lead out of social, normative reasons such as a sense of commitment to a group or in response to a certain norm prevalent in society.
- 3rd. Non-calculative motivation to lead (NCMTL). This motivation extends along a continuum: the more non-calculative the motivation to lead, the higher the probability that the individual in question will not make calculations of profit and loss related to the leadership role. The more calculative the motivation, the more this person will aspire to lead in order to acquire personal gain from the position. Chan prefers to relate to the non-calculative side, since he sees every leadership role as entailing a certain sacrifice.

Therefore, the less calculative the motivation, the better the prospects of the person undertaking the role (Chan & Drasgow, 2001).

In order to examine the MTL model, Chan (1999) constructed a questionnaire that assesses the strength of the motivation in each of the factors. He administered the questionnaire to three samples: a large Singaporean sample which included Soldiers in basic training, and two samples of Singaporean and American students. Along with the MTL questionnaire, the subjects received a battery of questionnaires that included a personality questionnaire, a cultural value questionnaire, and a leadership self efficacy questionnaire. In addition, data were collected concerning previous leadership experiences, as well as their grades in high school diploma and university entrance exams, as representing cognitive ability. The correlations between all the data and the MTL factors were calculated, and the findings supported the MTL model composed of the four components suggested by Chan: personality traits, (cultural) values, leadership self efficacy, and previous experience of leadership roles. No direct relation was found between cognitive ability and MTL. It was also found that the three MTL factors have discrete paths to the four elements (which, according to Chan, indicates that inter-personal differences lead to the formation of different factors), as detailed below:

1. Affective MTL – people who are graded high in this factor tend to be socially oriented (graded high on an extroversion scale), possess achievement values, generally have more previous leadership experience than the average in their group, and are convinced of their leadership ability (high leadership self efficacy). They have a positive correlation with individualistic values.
2. Social normative MTL – those graded high in this factor are motivated by a sense of commitment to society. They accept an organizational hierarchy but not social inequity. They are in positive correlation with collectivist values, and are graded high on the conscientiousness scale. They have more previous leadership experience than the average in their group.
3. Non-calculative MTL – those graded high in this factor evinced a strong link to cultural values. Collectivist values were found to be in positive correlation, and individualistic values in negative correlation, to this factor. Psychological stability and agreeableness were found to be in positive correlation. No relation was found with previous leadership experiences and leadership self efficacy.

It emerges from the study that there is a correlation between the various factors (between 0.26-0.50), which led Chan to assume the existence of a general MTL factor of the second order. Nevertheless, the separate variance permits us to relate to each factor individually. Thus, different factors can be present at different strengths in the same person.

2.3 Ideological motivation to lead

As stated, in seeking to identify the MTL factors, Chan (1999) used social-cognitive theories that attempt to predict basic factors of behavioral intentions. Due to the complexity of the phenomenon (the MTL model is composed of multi-dimensional elements such as values, personality traits, and previous experiences), it is necessary to examine whether there are other MTL factors that can help in predicting the emergence of leadership behavior and in developing the model. The importance of examining additional factors lies in the assumption that every motivational factor for leadership has specific implications for the emergence of leadership in practice, because the motivation determines

the strength, the direction and the persistence of the specific aim to which the individual aspires (Kanfer, 1990). Thus, by locating additional factors of motivation to lead, we can expand our understanding concerning these aims. Our argument is that one such possible factor is **ideological motivation to lead (IMTL)**.

An ideology has been defined as “a system, a set of ideas, a certain view of the national or social interest”, and an idealist as “a person with aspirations and ideals, who is prepared to make sacrifices for the sake of realizing his ideals in full or in part” (Even Shoshan, 1951).

Gal (1999) reviews the motivation of army recruits, including the ideological motivation for military service. In his opinion, the characteristics of this motivation include strong belief in the ideological approach, legitimization of actions performed in the name of this ideology, and strong emotional involvement related to “love” (love of one’s country). Fritz (1996) refers to ideological military motivation as a major factor in the internal unity of the Wehrmacht, which contributed to their success in battle at the beginning of World War II. In an ideological system the leader has a significant role. Gal (1999) sees the commander in an ideological army as a player whose role is to educate, admonish, and transmit the ideology to his Soldiers beyond his role as a tactical commander.

Based on all the above, ideological motivation to lead may be defined as *“a desire to lead out of principles that constitute an ideological world view. Being in a leadership role permits individuals to preserve their world view, educate their followers, and inculcate in them (if the framework permits) the principles of the leader’s belief.”*

The singularity of the ideological motivation to lead lies in the individuals’ belief that the very fact of being in a leadership role serves their ideological principles. This is the source of their emotional satisfaction. Our assumption is that persons with social-normative MTL can act according to a social norm that stems from the fact of their commitment to society without any ideational aim behind it. For those with ideological MTL, the ideational aim is the major motive for their leadership, and through this they can see themselves committed to their followers and to society. In addition, the ideological leader can often adopt a non-normative ideology, and act in a manner contrary to the norm. While in non-calculative MTL, considerations (or the lack thereof) of profit and loss are the main thing, in ideological MTL these considerations (relating to ideological profit) are an important, but not a major factor. The major factor is the leader’s very knowledge that s/he is acting out of ideological principles.

A possible proof of the effectiveness of ideological motivation in general and ideological motivation to lead in particular may be found in studies that examined motivation for army enlistment among youth in Israel (Gal, Mayseless & Fishoff, 1989; Ezrachi & Gal, 1995). These studies found that students in state-religious schools showed a higher average level of motivation to enlist in the IDF than students in general state schools in the following dimensions: motivation to serve in the regular army, motivation to serve in combat units, and motivation for officer roles (particularly high among students from beyond the green line). When they were asked to state (out of a list) the reasons for their motivation to enlist, the students in the state-religious schools gave significantly higher scores to reasons such as “the opportunity to serve the state”, and “to fight Israel’s enemies” than students in general state schools (who gave higher scores on scales of contribution to the individual himself). Gal (1999) noted that in the past few years there has been a rise in the level of volunteering for officer

roles and command in the national-religious camp, which in his view stems from ideological motivation to serve in the army.

Therefore, the present research will examine **whether it is possible to discern an ideological MTL factor, alongside the three factors proposed by Chan (1999): affective, social-normative, non-calculative**. This examination will attempt both to replicate Chan's findings in the Israeli context (regarding the three original factors in the model) and to test the existence of the new (ideological) factor that we propose.

2.4 Differences in motivation to lead among “leaders” and “non-leaders”

In the present effort, as stated, we will examine the development process of leaders. The general schema that we envisage, which is summed up in the formula (P x M x D), is that leadership is a function of three major elements: given potential (P), motivation to lead (M), and an ongoing development process (D). In order to examine this schema empirically, we will compare “leaders” and “non-leaders” over the three components of the formula. In the previous chapter we formulated hypotheses concerning differences between these two groups in the various components of potential (e.g., self efficacy). To conclude this chapter, which deals with motivation to lead, we will formulate similar hypotheses concerning motivation to lead.

As noted by Popper and associates (Popper, 1999; Popper & Mayseless, 2002; 2003), motivation appears to be a necessary condition for the emergence of leadership behavior, and leaders have a higher and more persistent level of motivation to lead than non-leaders (see also Zaleznik, 1992). In support of this, Chan (1999) found a relation between high levels of affective and social-normative MTL factors and a high level of previous leadership experiences. He also assumed that people with a non-calculative MTL factor would be more likely to undertake leadership roles than those with a calculative MTL factor. In addition, there appears to be a relation between high level of the ideological MTL factor and volunteering for special units and for command in the IDF (Gal, 1999).

In this research we will examine, both generally and by MTL factors (affective, social-normative, non-calculative, ideological), differences in the level of motivation to lead between recruits in the infantry and in the armored corps who are perceived in their companies as “leaders” or “non-leaders” (graded by their colleagues and commanders in the company). The general level of motivation to lead in the military will be examined by three questions that we added to the MTL questionnaire, which examine the extent of the subject's desire to influence others in the company, to be a commander and an officer. *The research hypothesis is that a higher level of general motivation to lead will be found among subjects perceived as “leaders” than among those perceived as “non-leaders.”*

With regard to the various sources of motivation, in light of Chan's findings pertaining to the link between leadership and the various motivation factors, *another research hypothesis is that subjects perceived as “leaders” will receive higher grades on four sources of motivation (affective, social-normative, non-calculative, and ideological) than those perceived as “non-leaders.”*

Since the present research examines and compares Soldiers in the infantry and armored corps, **we wish to examine whether observed differences in the level of general motivation and the sources of MTL between “leaders” and “non-leaders” have a similar or a different pattern in**

the infantry and the armored corps. This examination is required in light of the cultural differences between the corps and the different leadership characteristics in each corps (see Goldberg-Weill, 1996). Rather than formulating any directional hypothesis, we leave this question for empirical examination.

In conclusion, in the context of examination of the MTL component in the leadership development formula, we wish to examine a number of questions:

1. Can Chan's MTL factors structure be generalized?
2. Can an ideological MTL factor be located?
3. Do those defined as "leaders" possess a higher level of general motivation to lead and higher levels of all the MTL factors than those defined as "non-leaders"?
4. Is the above tendency (question 3) manifested in a similar manner among Soldiers in the infantry and the armored corps?
5. Are the patterns of motivation to lead stable in the course of the military career, or do they change over time?

Chapter 3. Leadership development

As stated, we claim in this effort that individuals with similar capability and motivation may develop differently and at different paces as a result of the specific conditions and events that occur in the course of their lives. These conditions and events may occur in the family framework, the school, and the social, cultural, and political environment, and also as a result of differences in personality traits, which may facilitate the development process, such as openness to experiences and self awareness. This argument is based on Avolio and Gibbons' (1988) leadership development model and on conceptual developments of this model (Popper, 2000; Popper & Mayseless, 2002; 2003).

From the above review of the research literature, we receive the impression that both the ability and the motivation components are interlaced with developmental elements. The attachment process is a developmental one which has its roots in early childhood, but it continues developing and changing shape through the individual's emotional experiences during the life span. The same holds true for self efficacy and locus of control, which are formed in the wake of experiences of success or failure. In general, we may say that these capacities, which express "self confidence", are partly innate or develop in the early stages of childhood and partly continue developing during the individual's life span. Optimism too, even if it has some genetic component in it, develops through the individual's experiences during his/her lifetime. The motivational component in leadership can also change and develop during the individual's life span, particularly in the case of motivation for leadership in the military.

Popper (2002) claims that we can distinguish between two types of characteristics in discussing leaders' development process. The first type are characteristics formed in early childhood, which become **basic components** of the developing ability. In this group Popper counts the attachment process and the initial development of optimism. The second type are characteristics that develop later in life (given the existence of the **basic components**) through processes of learning and experience. In this group we can find the development of capacities such as self efficacy and motivation to lead. The underlying assumption of this discussion is that the basic components that create the foundation for the individual's ability to lead cannot be separated from the developmental characteristics, since the nature and strength of these characteristics depend on the foundation (Popper, 2002).

In this chapter we will discuss the development of leadership as the totality of the events and experiences that the individual undergoes in the course of his/her life. The discussion will also take into account the development of the various capacities we have referred to (potential), but the emphasis will be on the aspects that accelerate leaders' development, causing the ability and the motivation to come to full fruition. Avolio and Gibbons (1988) propose a model in this spirit, in which the unit of analysis is the leader's interaction with his/her environment throughout the life span.

Avolio and Gibbons' model (1988)

Gibbons (1986) studied the developmental process of transformational leaders through personal in-depth interviews with a sample of senior managers. The managers were asked to speak of events and experiences in their past, from childhood to adulthood. The researcher analyzed the events on the basis of a combination of three developmental theories: psychoanalytical theory, which focuses on

early childhood experiences (see Zaleznik, 1992), humanistic theory, which deals with internal processes of awareness and introspection (see Allport, 1961), and constructivist theory, which discusses the interpretation and meaning ascribed by individuals to their experiences (see Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987). These three theories assume that the roots of transformational leadership are set in childhood. Out of this thinking, and based on qualitative analysis of the interviews, Avolio and Gibbons (1988) enumerated seven major factors in the development of leaders:

1. **Parents' high expectations, and their encouragement and urging of the child to achieve.** The leaders' parents set before them expectations for achievements and for the taking of responsibility, and also encouraged them and urged them on.
2. **Balanced family conditions.** Looking at the family environment in which the leader grew up, one can see that there was generally a balance between the natural urge to succeed and the expectations and opportunities provided by the environment. Sometimes the circumstances and conditions in the home were difficult (psychologically) but they provided the child with opportunities to overcome the difficulties and conveyed expectations that he would face up to them and succeed.
3. **The individual's ability to cope with his/her feelings.** The ability to learn how to cope with disappointments and failures in one's life.
4. **Exposure to many varied leadership experiences.** As a child and an adolescent the leader underwent a variety of leadership experiences, such as being a leader in a youth movement or chairperson of a students' council.
5. **Developmental orientation.** Leaders have a strong desire to be involved in "developmental work" (particularly as adults). In this framework they reveal interest in professional, social and ethical issues, while remaining open to the environment, to new experiences and ambiguous situations. Generally, this developmental orientation develops in the course of the life span and constitutes a central goal in the leader's life.
6. **Contacts with figures of leaders and influential people.** It was generally found that leaders had contacts with leader figures who served them as models for imitation.
7. **Viewing events as learning experiences.** The ability for introspection and reflection, drawing conclusions for the future. Mostly, the experiences do not detract from the leaders' self esteem or limit their exploration in the future.

Avolio and Gibbons (1988) argue, in the wake of these findings, that there is no proof that there are specific or universal stages in the individual's development as a transformational leader. However, the development of leadership is characterized as a process that continues throughout the life span of the individual, influenced by events that take place early in life and also later on in the life span. It should be noted that this model was developed in the context of transformational leaders, but we wish to argue that these factors are involved in the developmental process of socialized leaders. In an attempt to simplify Avolio and Gibbons' model, the developmental characteristics may be combined into three main factors, as follows:

1. **Family conditions in which the individuals grew up, their relations with their parents and the parents' expectations of them (factors 1 and 2).**

Generally speaking, leaders grow up in balanced conditions, namely, in families that provide warmth and support. In addition, their parents set before them expectations for achievements, encourage them and urge them on. In keeping with this research line, Klonsky (1983) focused on the study of the family sources of the development of leadership ability. His study examined variables such as birth

order, the amount of warmth displayed by the parents, quantity and quality of the discipline in the home. The research results showed that leaders underwent more powerful socialization, that is to say, they received more warmth, more discipline, were required to reach higher achievements and take more responsibility than others who were characterized as non-leaders. No statistically significant difference was found between leaders and non-leaders with regard to birth order.

2. Exposure of the individual to leadership figures and experiences (factors 4 and 6)

This factor involves the individual's learning processes. The primary learning of leadership takes place, according to the testimony of leaders, through observation of or exposure to models of leadership (Popper & Mayseless, 2002; 2003). The exposure to leader figures may both cause them to imitate these leaders' behavior and to develop aspects such as beliefs and outlooks which are transmitted by these figures. An examination of the biographies of leaders (such as Nelson Mandela, Mahatma Gandhi) clearly indicates such influences (Popper, 2002). However, exposure to models or interactions is not the only source of development. We know from developmental psychology that one of the most meaningful sources of learning is experience. And indeed, leaders' testimonies show that personal experience played an important part in their learning about leadership (Kotter, 1990). Atwater and associates (1999), seeking to find predictors of leadership, examined a large number of mental and physical characteristics of freshmen at a military academy. In their fourth year at the academy, the students were divided into three levels of leadership according to their level of command. The researchers found that a background of past leadership experiences, cognitive ability and self efficacy clearly predicted a difference between the various levels of leadership, so that students with a rich background of leadership experiences, high cognitive ability and self efficacy, belonged to the highest level of leadership.

Successful experiences of leadership roles, whether in the family framework or in educational or social contexts, not only show individuals that they are perceived by others as leaders but also strengthen their own belief in their ability to be leaders. This effect is based on the concept of self efficacy (Bandura, 1977), which we discussed in the context of leadership potential. As stated, self efficacy relates to individuals' beliefs concerning their ability to gain control of events that affect their lives, and concerning their ability to summon the motivation, cognitive resources and actions required to deal with the tasks. This self perception develops gradually in an ongoing learning process, during which they gather knowledge from diverse sources with regard to their ability to function in various spheres. According to Bandura (1977), people acquire knowledge about their ability from four main sources: the first and major source is their experience of success or failure in the past. Success in performing tasks creates high expectations for self efficacy, and when these expectations are internalized, even chance failures will not affect the self efficacy. In contrast, many experiences of failure in a certain area lower the individual's self efficacy to the extent that they may avoid acting in that area (Bandura, 1986).

The second source from which people draw knowledge is through observation of the behaviors of others and adoption of behavioral models for imitation. This aspect is the basis of behavioral theory, whose guiding principle is known as the law of effect, according to which behavior is guided by past results (Skinner, 1953). According to this theory, reward, or positive reinforcement, of a certain behavior will lead to repetition of that behavior, while punishment, negative reinforcement, of the behavior will generally deter the subject from repeating that behavior. In this way, behaviors that begin by chance on a trial and error basis, become deliberate following positive or negative

reinforcements, and the individuals tend to adopt behaviors that give them positive reinforcement (e.g., admiration, prestige). This learning principle was expanded by Bandura (1977) to vicarious learning. This constitutes a major principle in social learning theory, which asserts that learning can also result from indirect reinforcements, such as imitation of characters in movies or of family members, when these meet with positive reinforcements (Bandura et al., 1963). Therefore, in the context of learning “leadership behaviors”, individuals who are exposed to leadership models who receive positive reinforcements (admiration, respect, etc.) will tend, according to the theory, to imitate such behaviors. In this light, we can see that exposure to leadership models who receive positive reinforcements can have a developmental effect at the level of behavior.

The third source of influence on individuals’ self efficacy, according to Bandura (1977), is verbal persuasion from others regarding their ability to perform tasks. Therefore, the expectations and encouragement of parents, who are significant figures, are apt to have impact on the self efficacy of the individual. The fourth and last source that may influence self efficacy relates to the physiological condition of the individual while performing tasks. Thus, at least the first three sources (early experiences, observation and imitation of others, feedback and persuasion from others) are related to the individual’s development over the years from early childhood. Bandura (1977, 1986, 1995) argues that self efficacy has motivational and functional implications. Individuals’ beliefs concerning their ability will affect the way they perform a given task, the amount of effort they choose to devote to the task, and their determination and persistence in performing it. Similarly, this belief will affect the choices they make in their lives. People choose to undertake tasks that appear achievable and within the range of their ability, and therefore the individual’s self efficacy usually validates itself. As discussed in chapter 1, leadership research indicates the importance of self efficacy in the sphere of leadership. Evidence from the analysis of various biographies points to the development of self efficacy to lead. People who believe in themselves and their ability to perform tasks successfully will be more suitable for leadership roles than those who do not believe in themselves. And indeed, the research shows that self belief is significant in the context of leadership development (Kotter, 1990; Smith & Foti, 1998).

3. Personality components (factors 3, 5 and 7).

This factor combines internal abilities that turn learning and experience into a springboard in the leader’s developmental process. Popper (2002) argues that the hidden basis of self-learning based on personal experience is the assumption that individuals have the ability to look at themselves and their surroundings without an impenetrable armor of defenses.

London (2002), influenced by the humanist trend, develops the argument that leaders’ development is rooted in the ability for introspection. He asserts that three major psychological processes are involved in the leader’s development and personal growth: self-insight, self-regulation, and self-identity. Self-insight is defined as a multidimensional concept based on individuals’ awareness of their strengths and weaknesses. This awareness is necessary both in terms of being aware of themselves (their needs, motives, and abilities) and of being aware of how they are perceived by others. Such awareness is important in leaders, because they need to be aware of themselves before they can influence their followers and even judge them. London (2002) argues that an important element of self-insight is individuals’ ability to collate new information on their concept of the self, and as a result to change their behaviors and performances. This process, known in the psychological literature as self-regulation, is defined as the sum total of individuals’ efforts to change their reactions

(thoughts, feelings, desires, and performances), and this self-regulation gives the flexibility needed in order to lead successfully. Finally, London presents the concept of self-identity, which stems from its two predecessors and represents the manner in which individuals perceive themselves in relation to others. According to London, an integrated self-identity is central to the growth process of individuals since it directs their behaviors. Thus, those who define themselves as leaders will adopt “leadership behaviors” which match their self-identity. These three concepts, which may be seen as expressions of the individual’s self awareness, are therefore central in the leader’s growth and development process.

Very few studies have attempted to examine the question of **self awareness** in the context of leadership. Bennis (1989) studied the sources of development of outstanding leaders in various organizations. His findings show that these leaders had exceptional ability for self-insight, as well as inquiring observation of their environment. Cox and Cooper (1989) interviewed 45 CEOs in order to examine whether there were similarities in their background, personality and behavioral characteristics. One of their findings was that these managers had high self awareness, both regarding themselves and their environment, which permitted them to make the best of amorphous and problematic situations.

Popper (2000) claims that it is not possible to separate the individual’s self-insight and self awareness from the basic elements related to self confidence. The element of self confidence in its basic psychological senses carries great weight in the capacity for learning and introspection. Individuals with self confidence will be capable of criticizing themselves and accepting criticism from the environment, and therefore will gain more from various life experiences. In this way, the basic elements serve as a filter of the individual’s ability for personal growth and self-insight.

The individual’s personal growth and development process also relates to another important personality trait -- openness to experience. This trait, which is defined in the psychological literature on personality as one of the “Big Five” dimensions of personality (Costa & McCrae, 1992), incorporates characteristics such as imagination, curiosity, innovativeness, artistic inclinations, flexibility, and intellectual interest. Studies show that people characterized as open actively seek new and varied experiences, think creatively, enjoy exposure to new ideas and cope with ambiguous and complex situations (McCrae, 1987; MaCrae & Costa, 1997; Feist, 1998). McCrae and Costa (1997) also found that people defined as open tend to support liberal parties and adhere to social values. Furthermore, their readiness to question existing values and seek the unfamiliar leads these people to higher moral development.

A few studies have tried to examine the subject of openness to experience in the context of leadership (Keller, 1999; Judge & Bono, 2000; Judge et al., 2002; McCormack & Mellor, 2002). Judge and Bono (2000) examined the link between the Big Five and transformational leadership. In another study, Judge and associates (2002), using the technique of meta-analysis, reviewed the findings of leadership research conducted using the Big Five model. This study, too, indicates a correlation between leadership and openness to experience. McCormack and Mellor (2002), who studied officers in the Australian military, found that high scores on the dimension of openness to experience predicted higher leadership performance. The definition of this personality trait shows clearly that people who neither fear nor avoid new experiences will find many more opportunities for new experiences and will be more open to new ideas. Openness to experience and awareness of the

self and the environment therefore testify to the individual's involvement in processes of personal growth. There is no doubt that this process is linked to the (potential) basic abilities related to self confidence. A person with self confidence will be capable of self criticism and of accepting criticism from the environment, will have less fear of experiencing and learning, and will therefore also derive more from this learning process.

It thus emerges that in order to gain a deeper understanding of the development of leadership, empirical research with a broader scope is needed. In accordance with this line of thinking, there are scholars who see great importance in developing qualitative approaches in leadership research in general and leadership development in particular (Conger, 1988; Parry, 1998). They claim that qualitative approaches are required due to the developmental character of the leadership phenomenon, and also because leadership research has yet to develop a comprehensive theory on the nature of this developmental process. The theoretical framework proposed by Popper (2002), and the model of Avolio and Gibbons (1988), create a broad and deep conceptual frame of reference that is appropriate for qualitative developmental research and suits the current research trend that advocates broader observation. The present research will examine empirically the developmental component in the proposed leadership formula on the base of these models. For this purpose, we will use both quantitative and qualitative methods.

Our two major research hypotheses pertaining to leaders' development are:

1. *Subjects perceived as "leaders" were exposed in the course of their lives to more experiences of leadership and leadership figures than subjects perceived as "non-leaders."*
2. *Subjects perceived as "leaders" will be more open to experiences and have higher self awareness than subjects perceived as "non-leaders."*

These two hypotheses can be examined empirically, at least partly, by quantitative methods (questionnaires). However, in order to obtain a broader and more comprehensive picture of leaders' developmental process, we will also perform a qualitative analysis of semi-structured in-depth interviews with soldiers defined in their companies as "leaders" and "non-leaders." This kind of analysis will permit an empirical examination of Popper's (2002) and Avolio and Gibbons' (1988) conceptual models of leadership development.

Chapter 4. Military leadership

This effort seeks to develop a general statement concerning leaders' developmental process. As stated, according to the proposed formula, leadership is a function of given potential, motivation to lead, and developmental characteristics of the individual throughout his/her life span. This claim will be examined empirically on Soldiers in the Israel Defense Forces (IDF). The IDF can serve as a suitable research laboratory for the examination of issues related to leadership development. By means of follow-up on Soldiers in the course of their military careers (from recruitment to entering officer and command courses) it is possible to examine issues related to potential, motivation and development. Although we aim to formulate a general statement concerning leadership development, not necessarily military, the fact that the Israeli army serves as our research laboratory calls for a review of the characteristics of this army and the leadership that develops in it. This chapter will present a brief overview of the Israeli army, examining its commanders' leadership characteristics. It will also examine whether there are differences in the perception of leadership and its characteristics within the military framework (between different corps). This review will include a comparison with the situation in other armies in the world (particularly in the USA).

The IDF was officially established on May 26, 1948, at the beginning of the War of Independence. It was composed of a number of military bodies that had operated before the establishment of the state (the Haganah, the Palmach, and the underground movements). Two major facts are important for an understanding of military service in Israel. One is that this military was established during wartime, which made it a fighting force from its inception. The second concerns its character as a national service which includes compulsory service (the draft) for all Jewish citizens, career Soldiers and officers, and reserve service after completing compulsory service (Gal, 1986).

An examination of the structure of the Israeli army and the leadership routes in it indicates its difference from other western armies (such as the American, British or French). The Israeli army is led by officers (Gabriel & Gal, 1984), who begin their military career as private Soldiers, like all the others. In the course of their training they are chosen for NCO courses and serve as commanders (squad commanders, tank commanders, etc.). The good commanders with proven leadership potential (examined by personality tests and sociometric evaluations by commanders and colleagues) are selected for officer courses (Gabriel & Gal, 1984; Gal, 1986). After a course lasting 18 months to two years the Israeli Soldier can qualify as an officer. Thus, leadership in the Israeli military grows from below, based on the **leader's personality**. The characteristics of the IDF officer derive from this approach, which encourages improvisation, flexibility and dynamism rather than textbook solutions. The officer has to be first of all a good Soldier in his unit, and the supreme test during battle is the personal example he gives to his soldiers.

A parallel examination of the officer in the US army emphasizes the differences and underlines the special nature of the Israeli view of leadership. The American army is an army of volunteers with no compulsory service. The lower ranks consist of young people who have generally chosen to enlist for financial or professional reasons. After enlisting they can learn and develop in the military, but almost solely in the ranks. Officers, on the other hand, reach the army via military academies (such as West Point) or the universities. A precondition for qualification as an officer is four years of academic study of subjects such as engineering, physics, or social sciences. The American officer (like the British or French) is usually a scion of a "military" family with a fairly high socioeconomic

background. In order to be admitted to a military academy such as West Point, the candidate must have recommendations from a Senator or a Congressman for his state, and this will be readily granted to someone from a “good family.” There is no resemblance between a young American who joins a military academy as a cadet and one who volunteers for the armed forces as a simple Soldier. The private will never reach a higher rank than that of NCO, nor does he aspire to be an officer. The West Point cadet, on the other hand, never considers the idea of being a private. These differences also dictate the relations between the ranks, and the officers’ leadership style. The young officer coming to his unit is greeted by the long-term NCO, who guides him in his first steps in the unit. The source of the officer’s authority lies in his status, his rank and his education. His leadership style largely adheres to the principles he learned at the academy – he goes by the book (Gal, 1988, 1991).

The special nature of the Israeli conception of military leadership, as opposed to the American (or British or French), permits reliable and highly relevant examination, because the Israeli leadership sample is based solely on personal characteristics. In addition, while the motivation to be an officer in the American army is largely instrumental, the motivation in the Israeli army is more complicated (Gal, 1986). The relatively swift route from the rank of private to that of officer in the Israeli army offers a living laboratory for the examination of leaders’ development in real time. Hence, the present research examines this development by following Soldiers along this route while addressing questions relating to leaders’ potential, the motivation that spurs them on and the manner of their development in childhood (the past) and in the military (the present).

We presented above an overview of leadership and command in the Israeli army. However, research shows that this view is overly generalized and that there are differences between different corps, particularly between the infantry and the more technological branches (the armored corps and the artillery) (Goldberg-Weill, 1996; Raz, 1998; Shamir et al., 2000). Goldberg-Weill (1996) examined differences in leadership styles between outstanding company commanders in the infantry and the armored corps, based on fundamental differences existing in the organizational culture of the two corps. The armored corps follows the British tradition, which values discipline and order, and advocates preserving distance in the military hierarchy. The infantry is based on the tradition of the Palmach, which was characterized by comradeship and blurring the hierarchical structure. In addition, there are differences that stem from the nature of the technology. In the armored corps the commander uses wireless to exert his authority, strictly observes the rules of discipline in the tank, and is measured by his professional skill. The infantry commander is exposed, he is in direct contact with his men, and therefore interpersonal ability is more important (Popper & Ronen, 1989; Goldberg-Weill, 1996). Goldberg-Weill found differences in leadership styles alongside the shared characteristics (personal example, aspirations for excellence). Company commanders in the infantry showed more personal investment, relating more personally to the Soldiers, more openness and involvement, and more attempts to persuade rather than use punishment, than their colleagues in the armored corps. Company commanders in the armored corps were more task oriented (rather than people oriented), kept more distance, insisted on discipline, and ascribed more importance to planning and order than their colleagues in the infantry. These findings match those of Raz (1998), who examined differences in the organizational culture of corps in the Israeli army that are characterized by different levels of technological complexity. While corps characterized by simple technology (the ordnance corps, the engineering corps and the infantry) reveal a higher transformational culture and a lower transactional one, corps with sophisticated technology (the armored corps and the artillery) reveal a moderate transformational culture and transactional culture.

In this work we will examine the development process of leaders in the infantry and the armored corps. The research design permits empirical examination of the question of potential to lead, motivation to lead, and the development of leadership among these groups of Soldiers.

A major distinction made by Burns (1978) between two types of leadership: transformational and transactional, set in motion the theoretical occupation with the field and led to the development of new concepts. While transactional leadership is based on reciprocal and exchange relations between leader and followers, and do not deviate from the followers' level of expectations and the normative framework of performance in the organization, transformational leadership is based on leader-follower relations grounded in emotions and identification, and arouses in the followers powerful motivation to function and perform above and beyond existing norms and expectations.

Notes

¹. An interesting conceptual framework proposed by Markus (1986), which is not in the field of leadership, may be relevant to an understanding of leadership potential and its connection to the other two components, motivation and development. Markus develops and examines the concept of “possible selves”, a concept that represents individuals’ ideas about what they will probably be, what they want to be, and what they are afraid of being. The possible self they perceive expresses the aspirations both of the individual and of the society in which they grew up. Also, this image is based on past experiences (successful or otherwise) and undergoes changes in the course of their lifetime. The possible self was found to be related to characteristics such as perceived self efficacy and locus of control, and has emotional, motivational and behavioral aspects. If we apply this concept to the area of leadership, we may hypothesize that the possible selves of leaders are different in nature from those of people who are not leaders.

². A major distinction made by Burns (1978) between two types of leadership: transformational and transactional, set in motion the theoretical occupation with the field and led to the development of new concepts. While transactional leadership is based on reciprocal and exchange relations between leader and followers, and do not deviate from the followers’ level of expectations and the normative framework of performance in the organization, transformational leadership is based on leader-follower relations grounded in emotions and identification, and arouses in the followers powerful motivation to function and perform above and beyond existing norms and expectations.

References

- Ainsworth, M.D.S., Blehar M., Waters E. & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of strange situations*. Hillsdale, NJ:Erlbaum.
- Allport, G.W. (1961). *Pattern and growth in personality*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Anderson, C.R. (1977). Locus of control, coping behaviors, and performance in stress settings: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62, 446-451.
- Atwater, L. E., Dionne, S., Avolio, B., Camobreco, J.F. & Leu, A.W. (1999). A longitudinal study of leadership development process: Individual differences predicting leader effectiveness. *Human Relations*, 52 (12), 1543-1562.
- Avolio, B.J., & Gibbons, T.C. (1988). Developing transformational leaders: A life span approach. In J.A. Conger & R.N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic Leadership: The Elusive Factor in Organizational Effectiveness* (pp. 276-308). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive View*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (Ed.). (1995). *Self-efficacy in Changing Societies*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership Performance beyond Expectations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bass, B.M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research and Management Applications*. New York: Free Press.
- Bennis, W. G. (1989). *On becoming a leader*. New York: Addison Wesley.
- Berson, Y., Shamir, B., Avolio, B.J., & Popper, M (2001). The relationship between vision strength, leadership style, and context. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12, 53-73.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and Loss: Vol. 1 Attachment*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and Loss: Separation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Brief, A.P., Aldag, R.J. & Chacko, T.I. (1976). The minor sentence completion scale: A psychometric appraisal. *American Institute for Decision*, 171-172.

- Bullock, A. (1991). *Hitler and Stalin. Parallel Lives*. London: Harper & Collins.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Bycioi, P., Hackett, R.D., & Allen, J.S. (1995). Further assessment of Bass's (1985) conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 468- 478.
- Cassidy, J. (1999). The nature of the child's ties. In J. Cassidy & P.R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of Attachment: Theory, Research and Clinical Implications*. New York: Guilford Press, pp. 3-20.
- Chan, K.Y. (1999). *Toward a theory of individual differences and leadership: Understanding the motivation to lead*. Doctoral Dissertation, Department of Psychology, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Chan, K.Y. & Drasgow, F. (2001). Toward a theory of individual differences and leadership: Understanding the motivation to lead. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86 (3), 481-498.
- Chemers, M.M., Watson, C.B., & May, S.T. (2000). Dispositional affects and leadership effectiveness: A comparison of self-esteem, optimism and efficacy. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26(3), 267-277.
- Costa, Jr. P.T. & McCrae, R.R. (1992a). *Revised NEO personality inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO five-factor inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual*, Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Cox, C.J. & Cooper, C.L (1989). The making of the British CEO: Childhood, work experience, personality, and management style. *Academy of Management Executive*, 3, 241-245.
- Eden, D. (1988). Pygmalion, goal setting, and expectancy: Compatible ways to raise productivity. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 639-652.
- Eden, D. (1996). *From self-efficacy to means efficacy: Internal and external sources of general and specific self-efficacy*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Cincinnati, OH.
- Erikson, E.H. (1969). *Gandhi's Truth: On the Origins of Militant Non-Violence*. New York: Norton.
- Ezrachi, Y. & Gal, R. (1995). *High School Students' Perceptions and Attitudes toward Social Issues, Security and Peace*. Zichron Yaakov: Carmel Institute for Social Studies (in Hebrew).
- Fishbein, M. & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior*. Don Mills, Ontario: Addison-Wesley.

- Gal, R. (1986). *Portrait of the Israeli Soldier*. Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Gal, R. (1999). Motivation to serve in the IDF in the mirror of time. *Strategic Update*, 2 (3), 11-15 (in Hebrew).
- Gal, R., Mayseless, O. & Fishof, A. (1989). *High School Students' Perception of Military and Security Issues*. Zichron Yaakov: Carmel Institute for Social Studies (in Hebrew).
- Gardner, D.G., & Pierce, I.L. (1998). Self-esteem and self-efficacy within the organizational context. *Group and Organization Management*, 23, 48-70.
- George, J.M. (2000). Emotion and leadership: The role of emotional intelligence. *Human Relations*, 53(8), 1027-1055.
- Gibbons, T.C. (1986). Revisiting the question of born vs. made: Toward a theory of development of transformational leaders. Doctoral dissertation, Fielding Institute, Santa Barbara, CA.
- Hackett, G., & Betz, N.E. (1995). Self-efficacy and career choice and development. In J.E. Maddux (Ed.), *Self-efficacy, Adaptation and Adjustment: Theory, Research and Application*. New York: Plenum.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 511-524.
- Hertzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the Nature of Man*. New York: World Publishing.
- House, R.J., & Howell, J.M. (1992). Personality and charismatic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 3(2), 81-108.
- Howell, J.M. (1988). Two faces of charisma: socialized and personalized leadership in organizations. In J.A. Conger & R.N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic Leaders*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Howell, J.M., & Avolio, B. (1993). Transformational leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(6), 891-902.
- Judge, T.A., & Bono, J.E. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 751-765.
- Judge, T.A., Bono, J.E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M.W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 765-780.
- Katz, R. (2001). *The potential to be a leader – comparison between "leaders" and "non-leaders."* MA thesis, Dept. of Psychology, University of Haifa (in Hebrew).

- Klonsky, B.G. (1983). The socialization and development of leadership ability. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 108: 97-135.
- Kotter, J.P. (1990). *A force for change: How leadership differs from management*. New York: The Free Press.
- Kuhnert, K.W. & Lewis, P. (1987). Transactional and transformational leadership: A constructive/developmental analysis. *Academy of Management Review*, 12 (4), 557-648.
- Lefcourt, H.M. (1966). Internal-external control of reinforcement: A review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 65(4), 206-220.
- London, M. (2002). *Leadership development: Paths to self-insight and professional growth*. Mahwan, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Maslow, A.H. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- McClelland, D.C. (1975). *Power: The Inner Experience*. New York: Irvingston-Halsted-Wiley.
- McClelland, D.C. & Boyatzis, R.E. (1982). Leadership motive pattern and long term success in management. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67 (6), 737-743.
- McClelland, D.C. & Burnham, D. (1976). Power is a great motivation. *Harvard Business Review*, 25, 159-166.
- Mikulincer, M., & Florian, V. (1995). Appraisal of and coping with real life stressful situation: The contribution of attachment styles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 21(4), 406-414.
- Miller, D., Kets de Vries, M.F.R., & Toulouse, J.M. (1982). Top executive locus of control and its relationship to strategy-making, structure, and environment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 25, 237-253.
- Miller, D., & Toulouse, J.M. (1986). Strategy, structure, CEO personality and performance in small firms. *American Journal of Small Business*, Vol.15, 47-62.
- Neeman-Nagor, A. (1998). Characteristics of personalized and socialized charismatic leaders. MA thesis, University of Haifa, Israel (in Hebrew).
- Peterson, C., & Stunkard, A.J. (1992). Cognates of personal control: Locus of control, self-efficacy and explanatory style. *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, 1, 111-117.
- Phares, E.S. (1976). *Locus of Control in Personality*. Morristown, New Jersey: Central Learning Press.

- Popper, M. (1998). *Charismatic Leadership and the Loss of Identity*. Tel Aviv: Ramot Publications, Tel Aviv University (in Hebrew).
- Popper, M. (1999). The source of motivation of personalized and socialized charismatic leaders. *Psychoanalysis and Contemporary Thought*, 22, 231-246.
- Popper, M. (2000). The development of charismatic leaders. *Political Psychology*, 21(4), 729-744.
- Popper, M., Mayseless, O., & Castelnovo, O. (2000). Transformational leadership and attachment. *Leadership Quarterly*, 11(2), 267-289.
- Popper, M., & Mayseless, O. (2002). Internal world of transformational leaders. In B. Avolio & F. Yammarino (Eds.), *Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: The road ahead. Monographs in leadership and management*. New York: Elsevier Science Publications, 203-229.
- Popper, M. (2002). Narcissism and attachment patterns of personalized and socialized charismatic leaders. *Journal of Social and Personal Relations*, 19(6), 798-809.
- Popper, M., & Mayseless, O. (2003). Back to basics: Applying parenting perspective to transformational leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 41-65.
- Rotter, J.B. (1966). "Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement". *Psychological Monographs General and Applied*, Vol. 80:1.
- Scheier, M.F., & Carver, C.S. (1985). Optimism, coping and health: Assessment and implications of generalized outcome expectancies. *Health Psychology*, 4, 219-247.
- Scheier, M.F., & Carver, C.S. (1986). Coping with stress: Divergent Strategies of optimistic and pessimistic. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5(6), 1257-1264.
- Scheier, M.F., & Carver, C.S. (1993). On the power of positive thinking: The benefits of being optimistic. *Current Directions in Psychological Sciences*, 2 (1), 26-30.
- Sarason, I.G. (1975). Anxiety and self preoccupation. In I.G. Sarason & C.D. Spielberger (Eds.), *Stress and Anxiety - Series in clinical and community psychology*, Vol. 1.
- Shelton, S.H. (1990). Developing the construct of general self efficacy. *Psychological Report*, 53, 899-902.
- Smith, J.A., & Foti, R.J. (1998). A pattern approach to the study of leader emergence. *Leadership Quarterly*, 9(2), 147-160.
- Snyder, C.R., Harris, C., Anderson, J.R., Holleran, S.A., Irving, L.M., Sigmon, S.T., Yoshinobu, Z., Gibb, J., Langelle, C., & Harney, P. (1991). The will and the ways: Development and

validation of an individual-differences measure of hope. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60(4), 570-585.

Spielberger, C.D. (1972). Conceptual and methodological issues in anxiety research. In C.D. Spielberger (Ed.), *Anxiety: Current Trends in Theory and Research*. New York: Academic Press, Vol. 1.

Triandis, H.C. (1977). *Interpersonal Behavior*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/ Cole.

Wunderley, L.J., Reddy, W. B., & Dember, W.N. (1998). Optimism and pessimism in business leaders. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28(9), 751-760.

Zacharatos, A., Barling, J., & Kelloway, K. E (2000). Development and effects of transformational leadership in adolescents. *Leadership Quarterly*, 11(2), 211-226.

Zaleznik, A. (1992). Managers and leaders: Are they different? *Harvard Business Review*, March-April, 126-133.